Appeal: 10-1783 Doc: 23 Filed: 04/20/2011 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-1783

EUNICE ARHIN, a/k/a Eunice Akua Ahrin,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals.

Submitted: April 11, 2011 Decided: April 20, 2011

Before WILKINSON, WYNN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied in part; dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jay S. Marks, MARKS, CALDERON, DERWIN & RACINE, PLC, Arlington, Virginia, for Petitioner. Tony West, Assistant Attorney General, David V. Bernal, Assistant Director, Liza S. Murcia, Office of Immigration Litigation, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Eunice Arhin, a native and citizen of Ghana, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) denying her motion to reconsider. We review the denial of motions to reconsider for abuse of discretion. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(a) (2010); Narine v. Holder, 559 F.3d 246, 249 (4th Cir. 2009); Jean v. Gonzales, 435 F.3d 475, 481 (4th Cir. 2006). To succeed on a motion to reconsider, the movant must specify an error of fact or law in the Board's prior decision. See 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(b)(1) (2010).

We have reviewed the administrative record and Arhin's contentions and conclude that the Board did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion to reconsider. Accordingly, we deny the petition for review in part for the reasons stated by the Board. See In re: Arhin (B.I.A. June 17, 2010). To the extent that Arhin challenges the Board's orders of July 15, 2008, and February 11, 2009, we note that she failed to file timely petitions for review of those orders. We therefore dismiss the petition for review in part with respect to those claims. Finally, we dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the

Appeal: 10-1783 Doc: 23 Filed: 04/20/2011 Pg: 3 of 3

materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED IN PART;
DISMISSED IN PART